

**REMARKS**

Prior to this response, Claims 1-3, 5-16, 38, 40, 41 and 43-53 were pending in the application, with all claims rejected. By this amendment, Claims 1-3, 5-16, 38, 40, 41 and 43-53 are cancelled and Claims 75-98 are added. Hence, Claims 75-98 are pending in the application.

**SUMMARY OF THE REJECTIONS/OBJECTIONS**

Claims 38, 40, 41 and 43-53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter; Claims 1-3, 5-15, 38, 41 and 43-53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Guillen et al. ("*Guillen*"; U.S. Patent No. 5,701,485) in view of Shoening et al. ("*Shoening*"; U.S. Patent No. 6,769,124); and Claims 16 and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over *Guillen* in view of *Shoening* further in view of Curtis et al. ("*Curtis*"; U.S. Patent No. 6,336,216).

**THE REJECTIONS NOT BASED ON THE PRIOR ART**

Claims 38, 40, 41 and 43-53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the Office Action contends that computer-readable media embodied in carrier waves are for some reason now intangible and, therefore, non-statutory. Claims 38, 40, 41 and 43-53 are canceled herein, thereby making moot the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

**THE REJECTIONS BASED ON THE PRIOR ART**

Claims 1-3, 5-16, 38, 40, 41 and 43-53 are canceled herein, thereby making moot the rejections of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(c).

## NEW CLAIMS

New Claims 75-98 are added herein, to claim subject matter disclosed in the application as originally filed. No new matter is introduced in the application by way of these new claims.

Claim 75 recites, *inter alia*:

storing within a database and in association with a file system, a first object that defines a first method and an implementation of said first method, wherein said first object is an instance of a first object class; and  
associating said first method with a first instance of a class that defines the properties of a file type associated with said file system, wherein the first method is not a method in said second class.

Claim 75 is patentable over the cited references of record because no combination of these references teaches or reasonably suggests associating a method that is defined by an object of a first object class, with an instance of a second class that defines the properties of a file type associated with a file system, wherein the method is not a method in said second class.

Each of Claims 76-98 depend directly or indirectly from Claim 75 and, therefore, is patentable over the cited references of record for at least the same reasons as Claim 75. In addition, each of Claims 76-98 recites at least one additional limitation that renders it separately patentable over the cited references of record.

## CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims (75-98) are in condition for allowance. Therefore, the issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance is believed next in order, and that action is most earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages or credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Date: 1/23/06

John D. Henkhaus  
John D. Henkhaus  
Reg. No. 42,656

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550  
San Jose, CA 95110-1089  
(408) 414-1080  
Facsimile: (408) 414-1076

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop RCE, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on 1/23/06 by Darci Sakamoto  
Darci Sakamoto